

**State Commission on Juvenile Justice
Meeting Minutes**

February 27, 2008, 10:00am – 3:00pm
1515 S Street, Room 510S
Sacramento, CA 95823

Commission Members in Attendance

Bernard Warner
Penelope Clarke
Don Meyer
Javier Stauring
David Steinhart
Suzanne Cline

Others in Attendance

Chris Murray
Suzie Cohen
Karen Hennigan
Allison Anderson
Marcus Nieto
Oscar Villegas
Chris Martin
Eleanor Silva
James Salio
Bob Takeshta
Marlon Yarber
Kim Bushard
Jermica Peters
Rosie Lamb
Rachel Rios
Joe Stephenshaw
Amy Jarvis
Keely Bosler

The meeting was facilitated by Penelope Clarke, Tri-Chair.

Meeting Minutes of January 24, 2008

A motion was made to by Mr. Steinhart to approve the minutes from the January meeting. The motion was seconded Mr. Stuarling.

Mr. Warner called for all those in favor of proposed motion. All members were in favor.

SB81 / AB191 Implementation Update

Rachel Rios, Administrator of the Case Services Section within the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), discussed her unit's involvement in the implementation process.

Ms. Rios discussed the following topics:

- State preparation prior to implementation of SB81 / AB191
- The four major components of SB81
- The number of Non-707(b) youth in DJJ facilities and on DJJ Parole
- Collaboration between DJJ Parole and county probation offices to prepare transition plans of youth
- Number of youth that have been Paroled, Recalled and Rejected per SB81 / AB191
- Community and Court Liaisons role in assisting the county with placing youth
- Type of youth now eligible for commitment to DJJ or recall from DJJ
- The responsibilities of the Juvenile Parole Board with regards to SB81
- Information provided to DOF on recalled youth and status report provided to CSA

County Juvenile Justice Development Plans and Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facility Construction Grants

Marlon Yarber, Corrections Standards Authority (CSA)

Mr. Yarber discussed the following topics:

- The four areas of SB81 that CSA is involved in:
 - ✓ Review and approval of county plans
 - ✓ Juvenile facilities construction
 - ✓ Administration of 5% Block Grants
 - ✓ Pilot projects with Alameda and Los Angeles counties

Mr. Yarber reported that Alameda County opted to utilize funding for the coordination of services with two community based organization for psycho-educational treatment classes and vocational training. In addition, Mr. Yarber stated that Alameda's targeted population is the 18-15 year old youth, not necessarily the non-707(b) offender. Alameda County has begun to serve the youth with the goal of stopping the flow of offenders to the adult system.

Mr. Yarber went on to report that Los Angeles County is utilizing its' funding for a Day Reporting center in a gang "hot spot" area in the Los Angeles area.

A discussion also developed around the County Juvenile Justice Plans and the use of the funding. Mr. Yarber reported that CSA will report out at their next board meeting on March 20, 2008.

A question/suggestion was made regarding the monitoring of the county plans and funding. The comment was made was that it would be the responsible thing to have a body monitor the implementation of the county plans to ensure funds are being used as stated, particularly in this time of state deficit.

Mr. Steinhart proposed the idea of recommending to the legislature that the Commission require annual plans/reports from the counties.

In addition, a comment was made by Allison Anderson that he legislature would appreciate hearing from the Commission and CSA on the state of the county plans.

A discussion also developed as to how to involve outside stakeholder in the process. Suggestion was made to have structured presentations to the Commission from various stakeholders. This item was set for the next meeting's agenda.

Kim Bushard, Corrections Standards Authority

Kim discussed the following topics:

- County plans for allocation of 5% Block Grants
- CSA process of review and approval of county plans
- Format and information contained within the county plans
- Status of plans submitted to CSA (as of this date 26 were ready for CSA Board review on 3/20/08)
- Options available for the counties to use allocated funds
- The approach counties are taking to use the allocated funds
- CSA's role in assisting counties with preparation of their plans
- Public access to county plans

In addition, in regards to the construction grants, CSA reported that several small counties do not have juvenile halls, so many contract out with other counties or agencies. Also, some counties are contemplating regional concepts. CSA reported that they are expecting a variety of projects to come forward.

Juvenile Justice Expert Contract

The information provided in the previous meeting regarding subcontractors was clarified. The total amount available to hire sub-contractors (experts/consultants) is \$50,000. The contract has gone through the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation process and is at the Department of General Services for final review and approval within the next 10 business days. A copy of the completed contract will be provided to Commission members.

The team identified in the contract is:

Chris Murray
Susie Cohen
Kathy Gookin
Karen Hennigan

Mr. Warner made a motion to authorize Chris Murray and Associates to fulfill the contract. The motion was seconded by Ms. Cline. All other members were in favor.

Commission Work Plan

Chris Murray, Chris Murray and Associates

Chris shared a PowerPoint presentation to determine the elements to be included and the structure of the Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan.

Chris discussed the following:

- Scope of the Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan
- Concepts on how to engage the stakeholders in the process
 - ✓ Regional workshops
 - ✓ Focus groups
- Risk Needs Assessments

- Information to be included in the report
- Evaluations of current programs with recommendations from the Commission
- Proposed contents of the Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan
- Future agenda topics which would assist the Commission in developing the Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan
- Chris will provide a draft outline and scope of work for the Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan at the next meeting and email a copy to the Members prior to the next meeting.

The group entered discussion and provided Mr. Murray with various feedback:

- The possibility of duplicating the data from the Child Welfare System
- The principle of leadership and continuing the work of the Commission beyond January 2009
- Suggestion that system is not offense based, but risk based
- Get input from counties as to what are the implementation barriers regarding the recent population re-alignment
- Emphasis should be placed on re-entry programs
- Review of Gap Analysis prepared by DJJ, CDCR
- Address the opportunity for vertical integration with county and state entities.
- Identify a tool to address the re-entry and aftercare issue
- Identify early prevention programs for dependent youth and status offenders that to try to deter them from becoming delinquent
- Address the issue of 601s – expanding the juvenile justice continuum to include early intervention/prevention
- Make recommendations regarding the use of county wrap around services which probation departments are currently excluded from
- The type of care and services for youth who normally would come to DJJ – What is the capacity of the counties to provide services to this population?
- Make recommendations to the legislature regarding what should be included in the county plans and the number of times plans are submitted
- Set up a data system and build in outcomes to be able to report on the impact of the funds on the SB81 population in terms of changing delinquent behavior. – How to measure the effectiveness of state juvenile justice dollars?
- The impact of language contained within the Runner initiative

Juvenile Justice Data Project Report

Karen Hennigan, Chris Murray and Associates

Karen Hennigan shared a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Longitudinal Outcome Indicators for Juvenile Justice Systems in California, Juvenile Justice Data Project Phase Two.

Karen discussed the following:

- The focus of the Juvenile Justice Data Project Phase 2 – developing a set of indicators that can be used by all stakeholders, allowing decision makers to look at the juvenile justice system as a whole and increase the capacity of county-level decision makers to monitor and improve their juvenile justice outcomes.

- Overview of how the data was assembled and tracked.
- The five variables by which the data was measured
 - ✓ Intake
 - ✓ Detention at intake
 - ✓ Yearly recidivism
 - ✓ Most serious disposition yearly
 - ✓ Charge associated with the most serious disposition
- Four recommendations that are relevant to the suggestions that the Commission is going to make about how to move forward in developing longitudinal outcome indicators for the juvenile justice system. The recommendations are as follows:
 - ✓ Enter scores from valid nationally recognized risk assessments in the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) for each juvenile entering the system
 - ✓ Record in JCPSS which intervention models individuals receive
 - ✓ Modify incompatible and outdated JCPSS codes to facilitate longitudinal outcome reviews
 - ✓ Mandate routine longitudinal reviews of juvenile justice outcomes, strengthened by the recommendations above

Closing Remarks

All Commission members agreed to hold the next meeting on March 27, 2008 at the Division of Juvenile Justice Headquarter, Room 206, in Sacramento. The facilitator of the next meeting will be Tri-chair, Don Meyer. Topics for next meetings will include review of draft outline for Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan, Summary of County Juvenile Justice Development Plans, Review of other state systems, and stakeholder involvement.